

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/888,656	06/26/2001	Atsushi Oohashi	Q64995	9112
5590 09/03/2004 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037			EXAMINER	
			GONZALEZ, JULIO C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,, abiiii.g.c.i, 2	2007.		2834	
			DATE MAILED: 09/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/888,656	OOHASHI ET AL.	
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Julio C. Gonzalez	2834	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 05 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicate and the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main	ig date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or	
<ul> <li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF)</li> <li>2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li> </ul>	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note)		-	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	

4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment

5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the

6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly

7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an

explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

8. The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

NOTE: \_\_\_\_

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5 and 14.

canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6-13.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the prior art teaches the claim limitations disclosed. Moreover, all the references are related in very similar fields such as electrical machines and soldering materials and methods. See Ebata column 1, line 15. With respect to the rejection of 112, the claim discloses outer end surfaces of the end portions, but the drawing and specifications are not clear enough as to identify the "outer end surfaces and edges" of the end portions. From figure 1, the end surfaces and edges could be touching the "edges" that are next to the molten metal or could be the end surfaces and edges that are completely opposite, thus figure 1 does not provide enough written disclosure basis for the limitations.

TRAN NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER